

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/466,178	12/17/1999	ANDREW PETER BRADLEY	169.1523	9858	
5514	7590 01/29/2004	EXAMINER			
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			KIBLER, VIRGINIA M		
NEW YORK,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2623	13	
			DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

V

					///				
			n No.	Applicant(s)					
-4		09/466,178	3	BRADLEY ET AL.	-				
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Virginia M I		2623					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	Iress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no ever y within the statut will apply and will , cause the applic	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONED	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this col O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 N	ovember 20	<u>03</u> .						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	<ul> <li>Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 10-24 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>Claim(s) 1,2,5-8,10,11,14-16,19-21 and 24 is/are rejected.</li> <li>Claim(s) 3,4,12,13,17,18,22 and 23 is/are objected to.</li> <li>Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>								
-	ion Papers		7						
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceedable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	epted or b)[ drawing(s) be tion is require	e held in abeyance. See d if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF					
•	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. ivo	te the attached Office	Action or form P1	U-152.				
12) ( a) ( a) ( a) ( a) ( b) ( b) ( a) ( a	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document:  2. Certified copies of the priority document:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti ince a specific reference was included in the first 7 CFR 1.78.  1) The translation of the foreign language processing the processing of the priority document.	s have beer ity docume u (PCT Rule of the certific priority unst sentence	n received. In received in Application Ints have been received Ints 17.2(a)). It is copies not received Ints 18.5 cm ints 19.6 It is copies not received Ints 19.6 It is copie	on No ed in this National S ed. e) (to a provisional s in an Application l eived. and/or 121 since a	application) Data Sheet.				
Attachmen	ut(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summanu	(PTO-413) Banas N-4-	<b>.</b>				
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		4) Interview Summary 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/466,178

Art Unit: 2623

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Amendment

1. The amendment received on 11/3/03 has been entered. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-24 remain pending.

### Claim Objections

2. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: "morphological process:" should be changed to "morphological process." in line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1; 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 14-16, 19-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Nostrand (5,008,752) in view of Tai (5,054,100).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 15, and 20, Van Nostrand discloses a method of interpolating a first set of discrete sample values to generate a second set of discrete sample values using one of a plurality of interpolation kernels (Abstract), wherein the interpolation kernel 16 is selected 15 depending on the type of image content including a local contrast indicator being used to indicate text regions represented by the first set of discreet sample values in order to optimize the

Art Unit: 2623

selection of the interpolation kernel (Col. 5, lines 41-57). Van Nostrand discloses employing more interpolation kernels providing different degrees of edge enhancement (Col. 15, lines 3-20), but does not specify including an edge strength indicator and an edge direction indicator. However, Tai teaches that it is known to modify interpolation of an image depending on an edge strength indicator and an edge direction indicator (Abstract; Col. 5, lines 56-58; Col. 6, lines 4-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the interpolation kernels disclosed by Van Nostrand to include selecting the interpolation kernels depending edge strength indicator and an edge direction indicator as taught by Tai because it provides selective edge enhancement in the interpolation images (Van Nostrand, Col. 15, lines 9-14).

Regarding claims 2, 11, 16, and 21, Van Nostrand discloses the plurality of interpolation kernels are each derived from a universal interpolation kernel (Col. 5, lines 2-39).

Regarding claims 5, 14, 19, and 24, Van Nostrand discloses the first set of discrete sample values are at a different resolution than the second set of discrete sample values (Abstract).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Van Nostrand and Tai do not appear to recognize including a morphological process. However, using a morphological operation is known in the image processing prior art, as indicated in the applicant's disclosure (Page 9, lines 16-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the indicators disclosed by Van Nostrand and Tai to include a morphological operation in order to emphasize the different areas to facilitate the differentiation.

Application/Control Number: 09/466,178 Page 4

Art Unit: 2623

# Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

# Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 15, and 20 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

#### Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/466,178

Art Unit: 2623

## **Contact Information**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia M Kibler whose telephone number is (703) 306-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00 - 5:30 and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

VK

1/25/04

MEHRDAD DASTOURI PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehrdad Dastomi

Page 5